



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—Having received several numbers of the LAYMAN. I have read much to enable me to arrive at just conclusions, relative to the different topics discussed in its pages since its first publication, particularly the article on "The Rule of Faith" in your June number, page 61, where you state—"We are, consequently, quite prepared to receive, as authoritative and obligatory, any unwritten tradition, *provided it can be shown, by unquestionable proof, to be derived from an inspired origin.*" Now, to show that unquestionable proof is my object, as well as to give proofs for several other points of Catholic belief, disputed by the members of the Established Church, and which are, one with the other, intimately connected. That the proofs hereafter given are not the only ones in Scripture in favour of my arguments, I do not pretend; they are the result of my own Scriptural research. Nor do I wish it to be inferred that I enter the field as a *controversialist*; my earnest desire is rather that some competent person may take up the subject, which I am very imperfectly able to touch on, and see your observations on the different texts quoted. In the most friendly spirit, then, I assert that

The Bible is not the only Rule of Faith; that perpetual succession of lawful pastors is preserved in the church (in the person of the Pope); that that church cannot err in its doctrinal teaching; and that it is, consequently, infallible.

Some of the proofs adduced for and against which I give in juxtaposition. Of course, I leave you to multiply the texts against these points of doctrine.

Roman Catholics maintain that—

We have not in the world extant divers books of prophetic Scriptures; for no fewer than 20 books of the prophetic pensmen of the Holy Ghost have perished, as the learned Contzen has proved in his preface on the "Four Gospels." This assertion of Contzen is proved, as far as is necessary, by the following texts:—Joshua x. 13—"Is not this written in the Book of Jasher?" (I quote from the *authorized version*.) Again, 1 Kings iv. 32—"Solomon spoke three thousand proverbs, and his songs were three thousand and five." Next, 1 Chron. xxix. 29—"The acts of David, first and last, are written in the Book of Samuel, the Seer, and in the Book of Nathan, the Prophet, and in the Book of Gad, the Seer." Again, 2 Chron. ix. 29, mention is made of the "Books of Nathan, the Prophet, and the Prophet of Abijah, and the visions of Iddo, the Seer," and chap. xii. 15, "In the Book of Schemiah, the Prophet, and Iddo, the Seer, concerning genealogies," which seems to be a different book from his Book of Visions, as above mentioned; and chap. xiii. 22, mention is made of the "Story of the Prophet Iddo," and chap. xx. 34, of the "Book of Jehu, son of Hanani;" and xxxiii. 19, we find mention of the works of "The Sayings of the Seers," &c., &c. Where are these prophets' books now? Yet we know from Scripture that what was said by those books was said by prophets—"That God spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets."—Heb. i. 1. "That prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but the holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."—2 Peter i. 21. All these texts go to prove that we have not now *entirely* the whole *written* Word of God; and that the apocryphal books (acknowledged, in the Vth. Article of Church of England, to be read by the Church "for example of life and instruction of manners") are *canonical*; for "the holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost!" St. Paul further proves that we have not the whole written Word of God; for, 1 Cor. v. 9, he says—"I wrote to you in an epistle." Where is this epistle? Hence we say, give us all the sacred prophetic writings ever written, and we will abide by the *written* Word of God as "the sole Rule of Faith."

(The remainder of this letter being very long, and relating to a different subject, we are compelled to postpone our observations on that part until next number, and we think it better that that part of the letter should

appear along with our observations. This letter is signed

"AN INQUIRER," Celbridge."

The above letter is written in a spirit which claims the most respectful and candid consideration. We regret much that the various demands on our space, rendered us unable to insert any part of it sooner. Even now, we cannot go into its minutest particulars, but we trust a consideration of its general principles will suffice.

We take first the sentence—"The Bible is not the only Rule of Faith."

When we affirm that "the Bible is the Rule of Faith" we simply refuse to admit, as articles of the Christian faith, things which are not contained in Scripture, and cannot be proved from it. And this, not because we would refuse to *hear* apostles, or other ministers who succeeded them, declaring by word of mouth what God had revealed to them, but because we find proof of the fact, that the apostles did not teach any other articles of faith than those which they have written of in the Scriptures.

This proof appears to us to be twofold—1st. We find no other articles of faith (besides those found in Scripture) which can fairly be said to have been held by the Church, as articles of faith, from the time of the apostles to this time. 2nd. We find a positive and general testimony in the early Church, that they had not received any other articles of faith than those about which the apostles wrote in Scripture.

Our correspondent thus states what it is that constitutes and proves "a true apostolic tradition"—namely, that it should be "handed down by a full unanimous report of all Catholic nations, attested by their universal practice and uniform doctrine."

We agree to this as a fair definition of "apostolic tradition," provided it be understood of a tradition so held by the Church from the time of the apostles to this time. And we expect that our correspondent will admit that a doctrine held among Christians now, *even universally*, if that doctrine were *not held* by the early Church as a part of the faith, has no claim to be an *apostolic* tradition. *However universal* a doctrine may now be, yet if no part of the Christian faith in the early ages, it is no part of the faith *now*—it is not apostolic.

It does not concern us to inquire whether any doctrine, universally held by the Church in all ages, must infallibly be true, or whether a doctrine so held *might* possibly have been false: for this plain reason, this is not the question between us and Roman Catholics. We admit and hold that every doctrine which has, in fact, been held as a part of the Catholic faith in all ages, is true, and is to be found in Scripture. The *practical* question between Roman Catholics and us is simply this—"Has the Church in all ages from the beginning held, as articles of faith, other doctrines which are *not* in Scripture, and *cannot* be proved from it?"

If Roman Catholics are really prepared to oppose our view on this great question, we should expect them to do something of this kind—to produce the creeds and confessions of faith of the ancient Church, and show us that those creeds contain articles of faith which are not contained in Scripture, and cannot be proved by it; or, if they cannot do this, at least to produce some of the great doctors and lights of the ancient Church, who have said that the public creeds and confessions of faith in their Churches did not contain all the *ARTICLES OF FAITH* which the apostles delivered to the Churches founded by them.

Nothing of this kind have we ever seen done or attempted. We earnestly entreat our correspondent to be "an inquirer" in this, and to try if he can find any answer of this kind.

On the other hand, we take all the creeds or public professions of faith which the early Church has left us; and we find nothing in them that our adversaries themselves do not confess to be in Scripture also, and provable from Scripture. 2nd. We produce without end the great doctors of the early Church, all testifying that these creeds contain the whole Christian faith. 3rd. We produce an equal testimony of doctors that the Scriptures contain all the articles of the faith which the apostles preached.

This we believe to be a true statement of the real question at issue between us and the Church of Rome, and of the evidence that should decide it. But if any one can show anything to the contrary, we are open to conviction.

We come now to the consideration of the difficulties which our correspondent feels about it:—1st. We have not the whole of the Scripture, for many books have been lost.

Any force which this argument contains, must be something of this kind:—"There may have been other articles of Christian faith contained in those lost books; and in that case, by confining ourselves to those articles of faith which are to be found in the existing Scriptures, we may be giving up other articles of faith which were in the lost books only."

Let it be observed here, that none of our opponents have ever ventured to affirm that this is actually so. No one undertakes to say that there really were any other

articles of the Christian faith in those lost books, but only that *perhaps* there were.

Now, supposing it were so, we do not see how the Church of Rome would be any better off in this respect, unless she could say that her tradition has preserved the articles of faith which were in those lost books; but this no Roman Catholic has ever pretended to say. So we do not see how tradition supplies this loss at all.

But the real question is—"Is it at all *likely* or *probable* that those lost books did contain any articles of Christian faith which are not in our present books of Scripture?"

Here we observe, that all those lost books were books of the *Old Testament* (that is, if they really were inspired books). It is true that one passage is quoted to show that one epistle, written by St. Paul to the Corinthians, has been lost. That passage is 1 Cor., ch. v., v. 9—"I wrote to you in an epistle." Our correspondent has taken this, as a great many others have done, as if it necessarily referred to some epistle *previously* written by the Apostle; and if this were so, there would have been an epistle to the Corinthians, which is now lost. But this is clearly a mistake. There is evidently a mistake in the translation. The *indefinite* article "an" is clearly a wrong translation. It should, at least, be the *definite* article "the;" thus—"I wrote to you in *the* epistle." And this definite article is very often used in Scripture for the demonstrative pronoun "this." We give only those instances which are *most* to the point. Col. iv. 16, the Douay Bible translates the same definite article "this epistle." Again, in 1 Thes. v. 27, "this epistle." Again, 2 Thes. iii. 14, "this epistle." Why, then, may it not be "this epistle" in the place in question, 1 Cor. v. 9?

A still stronger case is Romans, c. xvi., v. 22 (Douay Bible)—"I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord." Will any Roman Catholic say that the Greek word here translated "this" must refer to a former epistle which the apostle wrote to the Romans, and that, therefore, we have lost one Epistle to the Romans too? Why, then, cannot the same Greek word be translated "this" in the Epistle to the Corinthians?

This last passage (Rom. xvi. 22) is still more forcible, because it also contains the same word, "wrote," in the very same tense. It clearly should have been translated—"I, Tertius, who have written this epistle," he being St. Paul's scribe in writing it. In the same way, the very same words in 1 Cor. v. 9 should be translated—"I have written to you in *this* epistle," referring to what he had already said of the fornicator in v. 2—"that he might be taken away from among you," which plainly implied that they were not to keep company with him. The apostle goes on, in the tenth verse, to explain what this command did not mean—viz., not every fornicator; and in verse 11 he explains what was really the meaning of what he had written, to this effect—"But now I have written to you, not to keep company," &c. Where mark, 1st, the words, "I have written," are still the same word, and the same tense, translated "I wrote" in verse 9; and, 2nd, the word "now" does not, either in Greek or English, always mean to contrast the present time with the past time. We may say to a person, "Now, I tell you this," without at all implying that we have told him something else at a former time: we may and often do use that expression about a thing of which we have never spoken before. We have such a use of the same Greek word and the same English word, in Hebrews xi., v. 15 and 16—"If they had been mindful of that country from which they came out . . . But now they desire a heavenly country;" where "*now*" does not mean, "they desire at this time;" but it is just as much as if the apostle had said—"But now I tell you it was the heavenly country they then desired, and not the earthly."

So the apostle's meaning, in 1 Cor. 5, v. 9, 10, 11, is simply this—"I have written to you in this epistle, not to keep company with fornicators. But I don't mean every fornicator. But now I tell you the exact meaning of what I have written, every fornicator that is called a brother (*i.e.*, a Christian), with such a one to keep no company."

To confirm this translation, we appeal to tradition. We say it is the general tradition of the ancient Church that the apostle wrote *only two* Epistles to the Corinthians; and, therefore, he cannot have written *another* to them before the *two* that we have. All the ancients who have left us lists of what the apostles did write, speak of only two epistles written by him to the Corinthians. This is a point on which the tradition of the Church is the *proper evidence*, and we invite those who are so fond of tradition to decide this point by tradition.

Hence it appears that the *only proof* offered, that one of the books of the *New Testament* has been lost, utterly fails, and there is no proof at all of any such thing. We have, therefore, to consider the "lost books" as belonging only to the Old Testament.

Now, supposing for the present that these lost books were really inspired Scripture (which we will consider again), but supposing now even that they were, is there any reason to suppose that those books contained any *other* "articles of the Christian faith" besides those articles of faith which we find in the New Testament?

Now we ask our "inquirer" to consider, in which *Christian faith*, he expects to find "the articles of the Christian faith," in the Old or in the New? Who was it that revealed and declared to the world the doctrines of the Gospel, and the articles of the Christian faith? Was it not Christ and his apostles? Well, then, in the words of Christ and his apostles, and in their writings, we expect to find the articles of the Christian faith, and not in the Old Testament writings, which were finished 300 years before Christ came.

We do not undervalue the Old Testament. There are many things to be learned by us besides "articles of faith." In the Old Testament we learn much of the character and the dealings of God, and we learn there, too, the corruption of human nature. In the Old Testament, too (when rightly explained by the New), we find many glorious prophecies concerning the Gospel, and the doctrines of the Gospel, which serve to throw great light on the New Testament. The Old Testament was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ: in the New, Christ and his doctrines are revealed to us. This we are bold to affirm (and we expect no Roman Catholic will contradict it)—that there is no article of Gospel faith prophesied of in the *Old Testament* which is not declared and revealed in the *New Testament*. Take any book you please of the Old Testament—Joshua, for instance, or Judges, or the Proverbs, or even the evangelical prophet Isaiah—and tell us *what* article of the Christian faith we would now be without, if that book had been lost? And if this be so, with the whole of the Old Testament that *we have*, what show of reason can there be for supposing that we have lost any article of the Christian faith by the loss of any other books of the Old Testament, if any have really been lost?

Our correspondent's letter suggests to us another argument on this subject.

He says:—"Our Lord, in expounding to his apostles *ALL* the prophets, must have included those prophetic writings not now extant." Well, if he did, we trust we still have, in what those apostles taught, any articles of Christian faith contained in those books, although the books themselves be lost. If those books did contain such things, and if those books be now lost, all that either the Church of Rome or we can now do is, to seek for what the apostles taught. What they wrote in Scripture we *know* is their teaching. If any one can show us that anything *else* taught by the apostles has been handed down to us by the Catholic Church from the times of the apostles themselves, so that we may be sure that it really came from them, let them show us this too, and we have already expressed our readiness to believe it. Does not our "Inquirer" now see that this is the only thing that *ought* to convince us that we are *wrong*—namely, to point out to us *other* articles of faith, and to show us that these have really been handed down from the apostles themselves? Yet this is the very thing that we do *not* find in his letter. Nothing will direct his own inquiries better than trying to convince us of our errors. Let him try and tell us, then, what articles of Christian faith, besides those contained in Scripture, we ought to believe. Let him show us *what* these articles are, and what the proof is that the apostles taught them.

To return to the lost books. What *proof* is there that the lost books in question were really inspired by the Holy Spirit? *None* of the places that mention these books say that they were inspired. We know that the apostles themselves, in their inspired writings, quote books that were not inspired. But it will be said, some of these books were written by "prophets." We grant that: but were prophets *always* inspired? We have good ground for believing that they were not: that they *sometimes* spoke as the Holy Ghost moved them, and at other times spoke as other men do. We believe this is agreed on all hands. Is there any better reason to believe that they always were inspired as soon as they took a pen in their hands? We see no reason to believe this. "A prophet" might write a letter, just as other men wrote one, and that letter was not inspired. "A prophet"—i.e., one who was sometimes inspired—might write a book of history, and that book might not be inspired. There was certainly, at that time, a way of knowing what speeches or what writings of a prophet were inspired. The prophets knew the difference themselves. And the difference could be proved to other men, while the power of working miracles existed, and while the High Priest could inquire of God in the tabernacle.

The question is, did the Jews, while they had these means of knowing, count these books inspired? We reply that there is *no evidence* that the Jews, while they had these means of knowing, ever counted any books inspired besides those which we now have of the Old Testament. We invite inquiry about this.

But when were these books lost? This may throw some light on the question.

We think our correspondent has succeeded in proving that no prophetic books were lost *before* our Saviour's time. He says—"Our Lord, in expounding to his Apostles *all* the prophets (see Luke xxiv., verse 27), must have included those prophetic writings not now extant." We think this conclusive proof that none had been lost before that time. The question is, have any books then existing been lost since? Now

this is clearly not the case. Josephus, a very learned Jew, who was born before our Saviour died, tells us what sacred books the Jews then had: he says they had only twenty-two which were counted inspired; they had other books, he says, which were not of the like authority. Now, taking the twelve lesser prophets as "one book" (which we know that the Jews did), this exactly agrees with the books we now have. It is impossible to bring into that number all the books our correspondent reckons up. Either, then, these books were not counted inspired in our Saviour's time, or they were lost before his time. In either case we have the inspired books of the Jews, just as they stood in our Saviour's time. If he found no fault with those books, as they then stood—if he did not blame the Jews for not having all the inspired books they should have had (and we know that he did not)—if he was content to take those books as they then stood, without asking for more or less, surely we may do so also. What better authority can we have than his in such a question?

We are, therefore, satisfied to take the books of the Old Testament as our Saviour took them, and the books of the New Testament as the tradition of all Christians has handed them down to us; and as far as this argument goes, we see no shadow of reason for believing them to be insufficient.

Nor do we see any reason, so far, for going to tradition for more articles of faith, until some one can show any such articles, with proof that the apostles preached them.

We now call to our correspondent's recollection a passage of his own letter—"Hence, we say, give us *all* the sacred prophetic writings ever written, and we will abide by the written Word of God as the sole Rule of Faith."

Now, if we have shown him that we have all the sacred writings of the Old Testament as our Saviour had them, and was content to take them; and, further, that we have all the sacred writings of the New Testament, that ever were heard of by the Church on earth, is not this enough?

And even if it were not, if any books had been lost out of the Old Testament, yet since at least we have all in which we could have any expectation of finding "articles of Christian faith," is not this all that we can require?

We trust, then, that our correspondent will now perform what he promised, and abide "by the written Word of God as the sole Rule of Faith."

We could not deal lightly with this argument about the lost books of Scripture. It has taken up so much room, we must leave the remainder of this letter for the next month.

"W. C. SEARCH" AND BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR.

"Warner Christian Search" has to explain, that he took the passage referred to in Bishop Taylor's work of *Liberty of Prophesying*, not from any edition of the original, but from a controversial treatise on Purgatory, by a Roman Catholic writer.

"W. C. S." begs further to add, that he has since consulted Doctor Taylor's work itself, and finds the quotation to appear, with the words ("SAYS THE ROMANIST") in a parenthesis. There is no writer, among Church of England theologians, whose works are so erroneously appealed to, and whose views on certain doctrines are so misrepresented as Bishop Taylor.

"W. C. SEARCH."

Sept. 24, 1852.

P.S.—You forget to observe upon some of the early Fathers—St. Chrysostom, for instance—declaring the practice of praying for the dead to be of *APOSTOLICAL TRADITION*.

We suspected that "W. C. Search" took his quotation at second hand from some Roman controversial writer who had given the passage without these words; and we find by his letter that he did so, though he does not give us the name of the writer who deceived him, as we think he was bound, in fairness, to have done, when we invited him to clear himself, by telling us the name of the book, so that others might be put on their guard against it. We regret that he has not done so; and, once more, we call on him, as he regards his own character for honesty and truth to tell us from *what* book he took his quotation from Bishop Taylor, otherwise, though we are quite willing to believe that it was not "W. C. S." himself that committed the fraud in the quotation about the Maccabees, we cannot exculpate him from the charge of screening from exposure the writer who did so.

We have not forgotten our promise of commenting on "W. C. Search's" passages from the Fathers of the fourth century, which he has cited as in favour of Purgatory; and we have already in type an article upon the subject, which press of matter precludes us from inserting in our present number.

KINGSTOWN HARBOUR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Please your honour, I read the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN* regular, for the master lends it to me; and since

you are so kind in printing letters, maybe you would take one from a poor man like me.

The master sent me to Dublin last week, with cattle that was going to Liverpool, for the herd was ill. And because I never was in Dublin, he told me to take a day to look about me, and he wouldn't stop the wages. So, sure enough, I went down to Kingstown by the railway, and, my! what a place it is! All them ships, and the steam vessels, all fizzing and buzzing, and seeming in such a hurry to be off, and the big stones, and the bright bonnets, and the purty faces, and all the cars, and the fine houses, and what isn't there? And them big walls running straight out into the sea, and, my! the stones in them walls! and every wall ten times as wide as the street before my door! And if I didn't see a big iron chest let down into the sea, and two men in it, going down to their work at the bottom of the sea as pleasant as I'd go to dig praties; and may I be happy if there was a bottom to the chest!

And while I was walking about looking at it all, I met a mighty pleasant looking gentleman, and I made bold to speak to him; and "please your honour," says I, "how long were they making all this place?" And so he answered me quite pleasant, and, says he, "I believe they're fifty years making it anyway." "Fifty years!" says I, "and isn't it done yet?" "No, indeed," says he, "and I don't see much signs of its being done." "And when will it be done, your honour?" says I. And with that he stooped short in his walk, and seemed to be considering for a bit, and, says he, "The parliament allows ten thousand pounds a year," says he, "for finishing it, and it is my opinion, that it never will be finished till that is stooped," "Well, tear and ages," says I, "maybe that's just the way with my father's soul," says I; for the thought just came across me all in a minute. "What do you mean?" says he. "Why," says I, "I'm paying ten shillings a year, for these six years past," says I, "to Father D—, for getting my father's soul out of purgatory," says I; "and maybe it's just the same way, that he'll never get out till that's stooped," says I. And with that he considered again a bit, and says he, "Did Father D— never say to you, I needn't take any more money from you, for your father's soul's out?" "No," deed, didn't he, your honour," says I. "And did you never hear," says he, "of Father D— saying that to any one else?" "I never heard of the like of that, your honour," says I. "Well," says he, "maybe you're right enough, and maybe your father's soul is like enough to Kingstown harbour," says he; "maybe, while you go on paying for the job it won't suit them to finish the job; and maybe when you stop paying, there won't be anything to finish the job with; and maybe it won't be worth their while to finish the job at their own cost," says he.

So, your honour, I don't know what to do at all, or whether to go on paying, or to stop; and I thought I would just write to your honour, that seems so knowledgeable, and ask if you ever heard of a priest saying to a poor man that came with money for masses, "I needn't take that, my man, for your father's soul's out before this." So waiting your honour's answer, I remain your humble servant to command,

PAT MURRAY, of Westmeath.

If any of our correspondents can report such a case as Pat Murray wishes for, we shall be happy to publish it, as we do not happen to know of such a case ourselves. Our correspondent need hardly have gone to Kingstown to see a chest without a bottom, where the lower places are concerned. We suspect there is no bottom to Father D—'s chest; and we are pretty sure there is no bottom to p—y itself.—Ed.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR OCTOBER.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

The *Dun* or *Winter Oats*, *Black Barley*, *Bere*, and *Rye* should be sown as early in the month as possible; if not already got in, advantage should be taken of dry weather, and while the land is dry to get in these crops, particularly the *Dun* oat. By so doing a considerable saving of seed will be effected, as if farther advanced in the season, and the land wet, considerably more seed will be required (see operations for last month).

Winter Vetches, either alone or mixed with oats or rye, should be sown immediately, where not sown last month, so as to insure a strong braird before the frosts set in.

Russian or *Winter Beans* should, if possible, be got in before the middle of the month. This hardy and productive variety is fast superseding most other kinds to a great extent.

Parsnips, if sown this month, on tolerably dry, but well-tilled and well-manured land, come in early, and produce heavy crops.

Rape sown in the summer months may be still transplanted in the stubble land, as directed last month.

Early Cabbages sown in July last should now be transplanted in well, cultivated and well-manured land, if wanted early.